

I am aware of the pending legislation that would relax the current limits of media ownership. As a consumer, I am against the idea. The current climate of corporate ownership has stifled the voice of individuality on many of our media outlets, especially radio stations. There is no need for a company like Clear Channel to own as many stations as they do, much less acquire more. These conglomerates are not in tune with what people want to hear or see. Smaller radio stations, the kind that take more risks, are threatened by these large companies. Radio used to be interesting, but now the stations are so rigidly formatted that you have to be a superstar in order to get played. Everything has to conform to what the owners think the audience should like. The result is a static format. Some people might not care about the state of traditional radio because they can get satellite radio. But I think consumers have a right to hear good music (as opposed to the narrow playlists of most corporate-owned stations) on a regular radio station that you don't have to pay to listen to. And satellite radio separates every form of music into a different genre, which is not as exciting as if there were several genres on one station. A daring radio station would be able to mix different kinds of music, but that is very rare in the era of corporate owned stations. Also, it is nice to hear live personalities on the radio (something satellite radio doesn't offer). Corporate-owned radio stations don't give non-mainstream music artists airplay, therefore limiting a listener's ability to be exposed to them, as well as limiting the careers of these music acts. There needs to be more individually owned radio stations, because they are more in touch with their listeners. They need more freedom in their formats. If the media ownership rules are relaxed, the radio industry will suffer, and so will the listeners.